UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,678	09/07/2006	Ulf Skarby	2380-1174	8758
23117 NIXON & VAN	7590 07/21/200 NDERHYE, PC	EXAMINER		
901 NORTH G	LEBE ROAD, 11TH F	DAGLAWI, AMAR A		
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		2618		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/21/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/598,678	SKARBY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

l A	MAR DAGLAWI	2618	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appear	s on the cover sheet with	the correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 June 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLI	CATION IN CONDITION FO	OR ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the application, applicant must timely file one of the following reapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appea for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CF periods:	plies: (1) an amendment, aff I (with appeal fee) in complia	idavit, or other evidence, w ince with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
 a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing d b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire late Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). 	isory Action, or (2) the date set r than SIX MONTHS from the n	nailing date of the final rejectio	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of exter under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sho set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later th may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	sion and the corresponding am ortened statutory period for reply	ount of the fee. The appropria originally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in complia filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extens Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	ion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, bu (a) They raise new issues that would require further cons (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bette appeal; and/or	deration and/or search (see ; form for appeal by material	NOTE below); ly reducing or simplifying th	
 (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a co NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121 		•	PTOL-324).
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _ 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s). 			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 17-32. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		will be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and swas not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to ove showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary a	rcome <u>all</u> rejections under a	ppeal and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER		•	
 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but of See Continuation Sheet. 12. Note the attrached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (P. 			ce because:
12. Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (P'13. ☐ Other:	TO/OB/00) Fapel NO(S)	_	
/Duc Nguyen/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2618	Amar Daglawi Examiner Art Unit: 2618		

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues with respect to claim 17, that DeMarco (US 6,047,199) fails to teach reducing the number of feeders and fails to teach a receiver diversity antenna arrangement and that simply having two antennas does not mean that there is diversity processing and DeMarco fails to teach "each RF signal received at each of the spaced apart antennas is at the same frequency and carriers the same information and that Demarco (US 6,047,199) focuses on transmission not reception. Howver, the Examiner further to given the claims the broadest reasonable interpretation inaccordance with MPEP 2111 without incorporating limitations from the specfication into the claims, the recitations of "where each RF signal received at each of the spaced apart antennas is at the same frequency and carriers the same information" has not been given patenable weight. Please refer to MPEP 2111.02 the effect of preamble. The determination of whether a preamble limits a claim is made on a case-by-case basis in light of the facts in each case there is no litmus test defining when a preamble limits the scope of a claim. The limitations in preamble has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble. In this case, the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness (See Kropa vs Robie). Furthermore, referring to Fig.1 and Fig.3A, the base station teaches multiple radios and the base station inloudes antennas where the base station inloudes an interface circuit and a pair of four-way combiners for combining signals from a set of radios and to which they supplied to switching circuit and to which the switching circuit contains a plurality of modes that passes radio signals from combiners to their respective feeder lines and if a fault occurs, the system provides redundancy path whereby a fault in the tower does not result in transmission loss. The bases station receives radio frequency signals and combines them using 4-way combiners and the combining occurs by combining multiple received signals of a diversity reception into a single improved signal..